

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated September 24, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, on the basis of the Aiyama patent (U.S. 7,075,666) in view of the Olsen et al. patent (U.S. 6,952,780). In rejecting the claims, the Office Action relies upon the Aiyama patent as disclosing a network with an image forming apparatus and side subsystems for processing data, wherein payment in the form of electronic money is received for processing the data associated with each job. The Office Action acknowledges that the Aiyama patent does not disclose that the processing data and the electronic money are attached together for transmission to the processing side subsystem. To this end, therefore, the Office Action relies upon the Olsen patent, with particular reference to column 25, lines 33-42, and column 59, lines 37-50. It is respectfully submitted that the Olsen patent does not teach the claimed subject matter that is acknowledged to be missing from the Aiyama patent.

For example, claim 1 recites the step of receiving, through a network, data including both data to be information-processed and electronic money as payment for the information processing, wherein the processing data and the electronic money are attached together. To further specify the distinctive features of the invention, claim 1 now recites that the electronic money that is attached to the processing data is an amount of electronic money that is necessary for payment for the information processing. The Olsen patent does not disclose that both data to be processed and an amount of electronic money that is necessary for payment for the processing of that data are attached together and received via a network. At column

25, lines 33-42, the Olsen patent discloses an example of a *billing* functionality, in which a user is prompted to select a particular project that a print job belongs to. The cited passage at column 59, lines 37-50, further explains this concept. The patent states that a print job is tagged with additional data that indicates "which client to bill the print job to."

Thus, it can be appreciated that, rather than disclosing that an actual payment for a print job, i.e., electronic money, is received with the print job itself, the Olsen patent discloses that the print job data includes *billing* information. In other words, it indicates the entity, e.g., project, that is to be charged for the cost of the print job. In the method of pending claim 1, the monetary payment for the processing of the data is actually received, and verified, before the data is processed. In contrast, the billing feature of the Olsen patent does not effect payment at the time that a print job is performed. Rather, it only identifies an entity to be billed, namely the entity that is responsible for eventual payment of the print job.

Furthermore, since the Olsen patent does not disclose that electronic money accompanies the data to be processed, it cannot be interpreted to disclose that such electronic money would be in an amount that is necessary for payment for the information processing. As discussed previously, the data that accompanies the print job only identifies an entity. It does not include an *amount* of electronic money that is sufficient to pay for the processing of the print data that it accompanies.

For at least this reason, therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Olsen patent does not teach the subject matter of claim 1 that is acknowledged to be missing from the Aiyama patent. Consequently, any possible combination of the

teachings of the two patents cannot lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to the claimed subject matter.

For at least these same reasons, independent claims 2-5 and 8 are submitted to be likewise patentable over the disclosure of the Aiyama and Olsen patents. By virtue of their dependency from these patentably distinct claims, dependent claims 6, 7 and 9-14 are also submitted to be allowable over the references.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: October 31, 2007

By: 
James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703.836.6620